UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,785	09/29/2003	Atsushi Date	03500.017602.	7534
	7590 09/06/2007 CELLA HARPER & S	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFEL	LER PLAZA	HUISMAN, DAVID J		
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2183	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/671,785	DATE, ATSUSHI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
David J. Huisman	2183		

	Cammer	Art Offic				
	David J. Huisman	2183				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mi	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
AMENDMENTS 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause '			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		umpliant Amandmant	(DTOL 324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(F10L-324).			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 7-9 and set forth in the final rejected:	vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attached sheet. 	,	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					

David J. Huisman August 29, 2007 David Africa

Applicant argues, on page 6 of the after-final remarks, in substance that:

"...However, Booker is not seen to disclose or suggest that EXCPU 14 and EMCPU 26 connect to a same bus, much less that EXCPU 14 and EMCPU 26 use such a same bus exclusively."

While fully considered, this argument is deemed non-persuasive by the examiner because Booker explains in column 6, lines 1-4, that after the memory operation is complete, EXCPU14 tri-states the memory interface. As is known in the art, tri-state, or 3-state logic, allows output ports to have a value of 0, 1, or Z. A 'Z' output stands for the output port being disconnected from the rest of the circuit, putting the output in a high impedance state. The intent of this state is to allow multiple circuits to share the same output line or bus without affecting each other. Tri-state logic devices are used to accommodate multiple bus drivers. If the outputs of several tri-state logic are electrically connected together, only one three-state logic device may be active. The other three-state logic devices may be in the high impedance mode and thus will not affect the output of the active three-state logic device.

Hence, the tri-stating implies that the multiple compoents share a bus, because the tri-state logic ensures that only one component drives the bus at a time.

In addition, applicant has changed the scope of the independent claim by no longer requiring that a component be reset but that a bus request be suppressed. This amendment would affect the examiner's current interpretation and rejection of the claims. Therefore, this amendment will not be entered as further search and consideration would be required.